



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/658,014	09/08/2000	Ryo Osugi	0171-0704P	2775

7590

07/23/2002

Birch Stewart Kolasch & Birch LLP
P O Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

LE, DANG D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2834

DATE MAILED: 07/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/658,014

Applicant(s)

OSUGI ET AL.

Examiner

Dang D Le

Art Unit

2834

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6 and 8-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6 and 8-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 September 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 6 and 8-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the dimension and/or the through hole, threaded hole, recess and bend recited in claims 1, 8, 9, 12 and 13 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1, 8, 9, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification

does not clearly identify the location of the holes, the recess and the bend in the Drawings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shinbo et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 6,185,076) in view of Jones et al.

Regarding claim 10, Shinbo et al. show a yoke component (Figure 1) configured as a magnetic circuit of a voice coil motor for a hard disk drive, wherein said yoke component has no burr on any ridge line of a finely machined portion thereof (Figures 16-18D).

Shinbo et al. do not show a yoke component comprising a low carbon steel.

Jones et al. show a yoke component comprising a low carbon steel for the purpose of making a more precise yoke.

Since Shinbo et al. and Jones et al. are all from the same field of endeavor; the purpose disclosed by one inventor would have been recognized in the pertinent art of the others.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to make a yoke component with a low carbon steel as taught by Jones et al. for the purpose discussed above.

Regarding claim 11, it is noted that Shinbo et al. also show a voice coil motor for a hard disk drive, comprising: a yoke component, configured as a magnetic circuit of said voice coil motor, wherein said yoke component has no burr on any ridge line of a finely machined portion thereof.

Shinbo et al. do not show a yoke component made from a low carbon steel.

Jones et al. show a yoke component comprising a low carbon steel for the purpose of making a more precise yoke.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to make a yoke component from a low carbon steel as taught by Jones et al. for the purpose discussed above.

Regarding claims 12 and 13, it is noted that Shinbo et al. do not clearly show said ridge line of a finely machined portion being a ridge line of a through hole having a diameter of 10 mm or less, a threaded hole having a diameter of 10 mm or less, a recess having a diameter of 10 mm or less, or a bend having a radius of curvature of 5 mm or less. Shinbo et al. just show the through hole, the threaded hole, the recess and the bend in Figure 1.

However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make said ridge line of a finely machined portion as a ridge line of a through hole having a diameter of 10 mm or less, a threaded hole having a diameter of 10 mm or less, a recess having a diameter of 10 mm or less, or a bend having a radius of curvature of 5 mm or less, since it has been held that discovering an

optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

7. Claims 1, 6, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shinbo et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 6,185,076) in view of Jones et al. and Landin et al.

Regarding claim 1, Shinbo et al. show a yoke component configured as a magnetic circuit of a voice coil motor for a hard disk drive, wherein said yoke component has a finely machined portion, said finely machined portion being a through hole, a threaded hole, a recess, or a bend. Shinbo et al. just show there being no burr on any ridge line of said finely machined portion of said yoke component.

Shinbo et al. do not show the yoke component comprising a low carbon steel and wherein there is no burr of 0.1 mm or greater in thickness on any ridgeline of said finely machined portion of said yoke component.

Jones et al. show a yoke component comprising a low carbon steel for the purpose of making a more precise yoke.

Moreover, Landin et al. show there being no burr of 0.1 mm (0.002 inch or 0.0508mm) or greater (column 17, lines 30-45) for the purpose of avoiding damage.

Since Shinbo et al., Jones et al. and Landin et al. are all from the same field of endeavor; the purpose disclosed by one inventor would have been recognized in the pertinent art of the others.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to make a yoke component with a low carbon steel and eliminate burrs of 0.1 mm or greater in thickness on any ridge line of said finely

machined portion of said yoke component as respectively taught by Jones et al. and Landin et al. for the purpose discussed above.

Regarding claim 6, this claim is similar to claim 1 except that it does not recite the holes, recess and bend of the yoke. Therefore, it is rejected as discussed in claim 1 above.

Regarding claims 8 and 9, these claims depend on claims 1 and 6, respectively. Moreover, they are similar to claims 12 and 13 which are rejected as discussed above. As a result, they are also rejected.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Information on How to Contact USPTO

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dang D Le whose telephone number is (703) 305-0156. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor Ramirez can be reached on (703) 308-1371. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3431 for regular communications and (703) 305-3431 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.

DDL
July 20, 2002

DL

Dang D Le